

REMARKS

1 In the Office Action of December 12, 2008, claims 37-46, 50-55 and 58 were
rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-
5 statutory subject matter. In addition, claim 1, 20, 37 and 56-58 were rejected under 35
U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,975,425 (“Abe et
al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796,401 (“Winer”). Claim 1-10, 14-28, 32-46 and 50-
56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Abe et al.
in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,841,435 (“Dauerer et al.”).

10 In response, Applicant has amended claims 37-46, 50-55 and 58 in the manner
suggested by the Examiner to overcome the Section 101 rejections. In addition,
Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 20, 37 and 56-58 to more clearly
distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. In view of the amendments
15 to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims 1-10, 14-28, 32-46
and 50-58 are now in condition for allowance.

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 20, 27 and 56-58

20 As amended, the independent claim 1 recites the limitation of “*scrolling said
geometric object with contents of said canvas object when a locking feature of said
geometric object is activated in response to the surface of said canvas object being
scrolled,*” which is not disclosed in the cited references of Winer and Dauerer et al.
Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of these cited references.
25 As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claim 1 be
allowed.

The cited reference of Winer discloses moving all of the objects in unison
together as a group when one of the objects is selected and dragged. However, Winer
30 fails to disclose moving these objects in unison “*in response to the surface of said canvas*

object being scrolled,” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, Winer fails to teach the above limitations of the amended independent claim 1.

Similarly, the cited reference of Dauerer et al. discloses moving a group of application objects a single movement. However, Dauerer et al. fails to disclose moving these objects in unison *“in response to the surface of said canvas object being scrolled,”* as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, Dauerer et al. fails to teach the above limitations of the amended independent claim 1.

Since Winer and Dauerer et al. both fail to disclose the claimed limitations of *“scrolling said geometric object with contents of said canvas object when a locking feature of said geometric object is activated in response to the surface of said canvas object being scrolled,”* the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious over Abe et al. in view of Winer or Dauerer et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 20, 27 and 56-58, which recite similar limitations as those of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, these amended independent claims 20, 27 and 56-58 are also not obvious in view of the cited references. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claims 20, 27 and 56-58 be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-10, 14-19, 21-28, 32-36, 38-46 and 50-55

Each of the dependent claims 2-10, 14-19, 21-28, 32-36, 38-46 and 50-55 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1, 20 and 37. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that, in any future Office Action, the alleged teaching of claimed elements be specified by particular reference numbers of corresponding elements in the cited references so that the dependent claim rejections can be better addressed. As an example, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner
5 identify the element in Figs. 8-10, 13-15, 22-23 and 25 of Abe et al. that has been equated to the claimed “*geometric object*” recited in the independent claims 1, 20, 37 and 56-58. As another example, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner identify the element in Figs. 3, 13 and 22-30 of Abe et al. that has been equated to the claimed “*canvas object*” recited in the independent claims 1, 20, 37 and 56-58.

Applicant respectfully requests a notice of allowance in view of the claim amendments and the remarks made herein.

Respectfully submitted,
Denny Jacger

Date: June 12, 2009

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300